

Plaintiff's Reply to Defendant's RESPONSE TO MIDITION TO COMPE

Hainfiff Kenneth L Holland, Respectfully state the tollowing in suppose of his position:

State Detendant's have had ample time to answer Maintiff's third set of interrogatories. On top of all this, the defendant's have tried to stone-- ruall Plaintiff by trying to hide behind the words

· security and priviledge.

- (a.) On az about January 4. 2008, Plainliff file a Motion for Extension of time, to complete discovery.
- (b.) Dearly one mouth later, flauntiff sent through U.S. mail a copy of his third set of interrogatories. One to the defendant's and one to the Clerk's office,
- In help propage the defendant's and their counsel of what the Maintiff wanted full disclosure of as "good faith", because if and when Plaintiff Motion is granted, both party's would have had a limited time to answer aixt respond.
- (c.) On March 14th, 2008, Hauntiff's mution for Extension of time to complete discovery and the papers in connection with, was granted. Credering that all discovery in this case shall be competed on the before May 1st 2008.
- 2. Plaintiff has had no opportunitly to confer or attempt to confer with the party not making the disclosure as he is "incarcerated and unable to have meetings with the defendants or to even call their counser.
- (a) State defendants was knilly aware that the Extension only limited the discovery time to 45 days at the time Plaintiff filed the motion to compet, 43 days had

past with no reply from the defendant's, leaving only 3 days inteal the deadline that discovery end.

- 3. It is obvious that the defendant's have the ability to answer submission in a timely manner rulen it suits them, since it only tack two days for the defendant's were as diligent with the Haintiff's third set of interrogatories, the Motion to Compet would have been muite, the Haintiff have given the defendants majority of the 45 days to answer, but they still would rather fight this motion instead of answering said interrogatories.
- 4. Defendants inaction and deceptions, as well as their desire to audid answering questions that are admitly relevant in the instant action requires this Honorable Court to grant Haintiff's Motion to Compet, so that this case can proceed instead of being mixed in stone-walling and proceasination.

Unerstore, the Haintiff respectfully request that this Nonorable Court grants his Midion to Compet, and order that the defendants to answer " within 15 days. and fitther delay, stone-walling, or procrastination on part of the defendants, without straing good cause for the delay. a order of judgment against the defendants should be order.

and failure to answer flauntiff's motion Competing discovery's after the 15 days, flauntiff request that sanctions be placed on the defendants.

Kenneth K. Holland # 164800

Delawake Correctional Center

1181 Paddock Road

Smyrna, De 19977

Certificate of Service

1, Kenneth L. Nolland	,hereby certify that I have served a true
And correct cop(ies) of the attached: Plain	HAP's Reply to Defendant's
Response to Motion to Compel	upon the following
parties/person (s):	·
TO: Office of the Clerk	TO: Catheerne Damavairti
United States District Court	Deplay Attorney General
844 N. King St. Lockbox 18	Hate Department
Milmington De 19801 - 3570	820 N French St. Sloop
	10891 3ct. caliss
•	
TO:	TO:
-	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
i .	
BY PLACING SAME IN A SEALED ENVELOPE States Mail at the Delaware Correctional Center	
On this 2 day of May	<u>,2008</u>
	Scrutt Holland

© IMULELY ET TO BIXE

SBI# 16 YEC UNIT DE

DELAWARE CORRECTIONAL CENTER

1181 PADDOCK ROAD

SMYRNA, DELAWARE 19977

EILE

SMYRNA, DELAWARE 19977

Fice Athe Clerk

For States District Court

Miniman St. Lockbox 18

MAILED FROM ZIP CODE 19977

ADMINISTRATE OF THE PARTY OF TH